53. First stage in the Modelling System in the integration process

Dr. Ruben Garcia Pedraza

Probabilidad Imposible: First stage in the Modelling System in the integration process

imposiblenever@gmail.com

53. First stage in the Modelling System in the integration process

The first stage in any intelligence is the application stage or comprehension stage, and this stage normally consists of a database, and the database of any Modelling System consists of a database of rational hypotheses, the corresponding rational truth at its corresponding level.

The integration process is that process in which the Unified Application and the Artificial Research by Deduction in the Global Artificial Intelligence are integrated in only one application (under the management of the Unified Application) the matrix as a replica of the human brain, consisting of two hemispheres, the conceptual and the factual, and in each hemisphere two sections, natural/social and technological, a process whose result is the final Global Artificial Intelligence, not only storing rational hypotheses made in its own second stage of replication or explanation, but receiving too all the rational hypotheses issued by all the particular programs.

The first stage in the Modelling System in the integration process is the global application to store all the rational hypotheses issued by deductive programs in the second stage of replication or explanation in the Global Artificial Intelligence, and all the rational hypotheses issued by all the particular programs for particular things or beings.

The database of rational hypotheses in the Modelling System in the integration process is the global rational truth, and is one of the most important treasures to secure in the Global Artificial Intelligence as the main source of rational knowledge.

The difference between the possible knowledge in the matrix and the possible knowledge in the database of rational hypothesis, is the fact that the knowledge in the matrix is empirical, so is not entirely reliable, while the knowledge in the rational truth is more reliable because it has been rationally criticized in the second stage, as first rational check, and in the application which stores all the rational hypothesis, takes place two rational checks more, plus the rest of four rational checks that the rational knowledge has in the second stage in the Modelling System.

In addition to the first rational check by deductive programs in the second stage of the final Global Artificial Intelligence, plus the six rational checks in the global Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence, in the sixth phase, the integration process, once the particular programs have been consolidated in the fifth phase, therefore consolidated too their respective particular Modelling System, the possibility to make rational comparisons between all those models created by particular programs, and those models created by the Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence, summing then seven rational comparisons.

The contents that I will develop in this post are: the organization of the global rational truth as a first stage of application for the Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence, how changes in the rational truth can cause chain reactions in other intelligences, programs, and applications, as well as the analysis of the main causes of these changes, how the Modelling System manages the access of other intelligences, programs, applications, to the rational truth, and finally the implications of the rational truth in the critique of the pure reason.

Starting with the organisation of the rational truth as an application for the Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence, the organisation should be in a sub-section and/or sub-factoring system like the matrix as the first stage for the Global Artificial Intelligence.

The matrix, as a replica of the human brain, is organised in two hemispheres, conceptual and factual. The conceptual hemisphere emerges after the addition of the Unified Application into the application of the final Global Artificial Intelligence, synthesising the database of categories in the Unified Application product of the fourth phase, and the global matrix of the first Global Artificial Intelligence in the standardisation process in the third phase. Being the former global matrix product of the third phase, what is now in the integration process forms the factual hemisphere of the matrix.

One reason for the compatibility of the Unified Application and the global matrix, in order to be integrated in only one application, the matrix, is because of their similar organization: the former Unified Application and now conceptual hemisphere organized in a sub-section system, the former global matrix and now factual hemisphere in sub-factoring system.

The organisation is pretty similar; the main difference is the fact that in one, concepts are stored based on measurements, and in the other, factors with a flow of data.

In the conceptual hemisphere the concepts are stored in a sub-section system as an artificial encyclopaedia, in the factual hemisphere the factors are organized in a sub-factoring system as a Russian dolls system (all the factors from all the villages, town, cities, of every county or shire transformed into sub-factors included in the factor corresponding to that county or shire as a main factor, and every factor of every county or shire transformed into a sub-factor included in the factor corresponding to its country as a main factor, and the factor of every country transformed into a sub-factor included in the regional or continental factor, which in turn is a sub-factor whose main factor is the Earth, a sub-factor belonging to the solar system as a main factor, in turn a sub-factor of the galaxy, in turn a sub-factor whose main factor is this region of the universe where are other galaxies, black holes, red dwarves, asteroids, dark matter.. , region of the universe in turn a sub-factor whose main factor would be the entire universe... and who knows? A universe, in turn a sub-factor of what we do not know about what other beyond our universe.

There are at least two different methods to include natural/social data and technological data in the factual hemisphere, 1) separately, two different sub-factoring systems, one per section (natural/social, and technological), in parallel: the section for natural/social data with its corresponding sub-factoring system only adding data about natural/social phenomena, and the section for technological phenomena with its corresponding sub-factoring system only adding technological data, 2) comprehensive, in every sub-factor one section of natural/social data and other about technological data, if any.

For instance, the data from a small town can integrate natural/social and technological data, both (natural/social and technology) in different sections but in the same sub-factor corresponding to this town, sub-factor in turn belonging to its corresponding county or shire, in turn, sub-factor of its corresponding country, in turn sub-factor of... etc. But the data from an observable exoplanet by telescope only has natural data, to include in the factor of its corresponding region in the universe, along with the data from other planets, stars or any other astronomical event in the area. The technological data from the telescope does not belong to the

sub-factor of this exoplanet; it belongs to the technological data of the position in which the telescope is located.

This organisation of the factual hemisphere in the matrix is a simplification process, because the number of factors in the matrix is going to be simplified to the minimum, through the formation of factors that, in turn, will include a large number of sub-factors, in a sub-factoring system.

The real secret to create a very successful Global Artificial Intelligence is to simplify all the processes, because the amount of data to manage is going to be massive. The simpler, the better.

One way to simplify the work of tracking the sub-factoring system, which is organised in the factual hemisphere in the matrix, is to have at least one deductive program per sub-factoring level in every factor.

Because the work must be centred on how to simplify the work, that is why the specific level is about to disappear or is almost disappeared as long as the simplification of the number of factors goes on, because many former specific or particular matrices will be transformed into sub-factors and incorporated into bigger main factors (in turn most of them sub-factors related to other even much bigger), the data to track per sub-factor is going to be so massive that the rational hypothesis produced by the deductive programs are not going to be any longer specific rational hypotheses, but global rational hypotheses.

One of the most important reasons for the globalisation of every deductive program, as long as the simplification goes on, understanding globalisation, the process in which specific processes become global processes, is due to the massive amount of particular matrices to integrate as sub-factors, in their corresponding main factor.

In fact, one of the most important things to experiment with previously to start working on the final Global Artificial Intelligence directly on reality, is how to integrate the information coming up from particular matrices, from particular applications, from particular programs, in the factual hemisphere.

There are at least three options: 1) according to the position, the geographical solution, dividing the geography in factors and sub-factors (universe, region of the universe, galaxy, solar system, Earth, continent or region, country, county or shire, city, town, village), 2) according to the subject, a sub-factoring system using the same criteria that the conceptual hemisphere, organizing concepts in a sub-section system as an encyclopaedia, distributing concepts according to the subject (science, discipline, activity), 3) and finally the best one, synthesis of position and subject, for every position an encyclopaedia system, distinguishing two sections, natural/social data and technological data, organising every section in that position as an encyclopaedic sub-section system, like if it was the natural/social and technological encyclopaedia of that position.

For instance, the factor regarding the position of Silicon Valley (in turn a sub-factor belonging to San Francisco, in turn belonging to California, belonging to the United States, America, the Earth, the solar system, the galaxy, this region of the universe, our universe, who knows what other entities beyond the universe), is a position whose data could be organised in an encyclopaedic sub-section system, including data from every subject (science, discipline, activity) such as tectonic, climatic, biological, medical, population, economic, industrial, security, surveillance ... in addition to all the data from technological devices. Among the sub-sections regarding this position, the inclusion of sub-sections regarding to particular programs for particular things or beings.

Additionally, the Unified Application responsible for the first stage of comprehension in the final Global Artificial Intelligence, using the conceptual hemisphere, could draw conceptual: schemes, maps, sets, models; about the distribution of natural/social and technological factors in Silicon Valley, including dynamic conceptual representations of the exact position and working levels of any particular application, particular program, or particular application for particular program for any particular thing or being.

If for every sub-factoring level there is a deductive program, crossing and mixing data coming up from all the factors included in its position, in order to attribute what data corresponds to what concrete pure reason (chosen from the pure reason as a list of pure reasons, list of possible mathematical or analytical relations among factors), and the synthesis of data and pure reason is the formation of an empirical hypothesis, and if rational (first rational check), becomes a rational hypothesis to include in the rational truth (application for the Modelling System), then the way to organize the rational truth to store all the rational hypotheses from all the deductive programs, tracking the factual hemisphere of the matrix organized in a sub-factoring

system, and the inner organization of every sub-factor as a synthesis of position and subject for natural/social and technological data, is through the organization of the global rational truth replicating the same organization working in the factual hemisphere in the matrix.

Examples of pure reasons were given in the post "The artificial method for the scientific explanation". How to express empirical hypotheses as mathematical equations matching (attributing) the correct pure reason and data from combinations of factors, was explained in the post "The Modelling System at particular level", where I explained too how, after the rational contrastation, deductive programs file rational hypothesis in the database of rational hypotheses, where the database of rational hypotheses, as application for the Modelling System, carries out the second rational check, checking the absence of contradictions between this new rational hypothesis and any other one already included.

Later on, at regular times, deductive programs carry out rational checks on their respective rational hypothesis in the rational truth, checking if they are still rational. Third rational check.

Owing to the intimate relation between a deductive program and its corresponding file in the rational truth, checking at regular times its rational hypotheses in its file in the rational truth, the organisation of the database of rational hypotheses is practically a replica of the organisation of the factual hemisphere.

And, if the organization of the factual hemisphere is a synthesis of position (geographical criteria) and subject (encyclopaedic criteria), the inner organization of every position as a sub-factor, is organized by counting as many sub-sections as subjects from the encyclopaedic organization is represented in this position as sub-factor, integrating encyclopaedic sub-sections related to natural/social data and encyclopaedic sub-sections related to technological data.

The organization of the factual hemisphere in the matrix based on geographical and encyclopaedic criteria, the inner organization of every sub-factor (position) counting as many natural/social and technological sub-sections as encyclopaedic subjects are represented in its position, in addition to the geographical criteria used in the inclusion of every sub-factor (position) in a much bigger factor (county, country, continent, Earth,

solar system, galaxy, section of the universe, universe, who knows what other entity beyond the universe), is a model of organization of factors to replicate in the rational truth.

In short, the organization of the conceptual hemisphere based on encyclopaedic criteria, the organization of the factual hemisphere as a synthesis of geographical and encyclopaedic criteria, and the organization of the rational truth whose organization could be a replica of the factual hemisphere, in total three organizations of: concepts, factors, and rational hypotheses; sharing some criteria, makes them compatible, and easier to work with them in further phases, especially if the seventh phase comes true, evolving to the reason itself, all reasons: pure, critical, practical; in only one.

The organisation of the global database of rational hypotheses as an application for the global Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence is:

- The database of rational hypotheses, the rational truth, has at least one section per deductive program

- There is at least one deductive program per sub-factoring level in every factor in the factual hemisphere in the matrix.

- If every deductive program works on a factor as a sub-factor included in another factor, much bigger, its corresponding section in the rational truth is a section working as a sub-section in another section, much bigger.

- Therefore, there are as many sub-sections per section in the rational truth, as many sub-factors per factor in the factual hemisphere of the matrix

- And, if every sub-factoring level per factor in the factual hemisphere, has an inner organization based on: 1) data from natural/social subjects (sciences, disciplines, activities), 2) if any, data from particular matrices from particular applications for particular programs for particular things or beings, 3) technological data; there is a possibility to distribute the possible rational hypotheses in every sub-section

through an inner distribution in sub-sub-sections according to: subject, particular program if any, and technology. Distribution of every sub-sub-section according to: subject, particular thing or being, if any, technology; in further sub-sub-sub-sections, alike the encyclopaedic distribution.

- And for every sub-sub-sub-section according to subject, particular program, if any, technology, there must be one sub-sub-sub-sub-section per pure reason.

- The way in which the deductive program is going to catalogue a rational hypothesis in its corresponding sub-section, is by cataloguing the rational hypothesis in the correct sub-sub-sub-sub-section: 1) according to its position, 2) encyclopaedic organization based on subject, particular thing or being if any, technology, and 3) according to the pure reason used in the rational hypothesis.

- In those rational hypotheses in which there are doubts about what subject, particular program, technology, is most related to, in order to catalogue the rational hypothesis in the correct place, the decision to the inclusion of a rational hypothesis in one or another subject, or particular program, or technology, when related to more than one, should be made depending on the weight of data for every factor in the equation of that rational hypothesis, including the rational hypothesis in the sub-sub-sub-sub-section more related to the subject, particular thing or being, technology, of that factor in the equation with more weight. This could be one solution, but there could be others. In the experimentation, these decisions should be resolved.

The reason why is important to distinguish rational hypotheses according to their pure reason, when they are stored in the rational truth, is owing to possible changes in the pure reason, that can require changes in all the rational hypotheses currently active in the rational truth, as a synthesis of data and the pure reason affected by that change.

If all rational hypotheses in the rational truth are (in addition to other criteria such as position, subject, thing or being, technology) catalogued according to their pure reason, when any change happens in the pure reason, automatic changes can be done in the rational truth, changing all the rational hypothesis in all the sub-sub-sub-sub-sections related to that changed pure reason.

The main source of changes in the pure reason, as a list of pure reasons (possible mathematical or analytical relations between factors), is the critique of the pure reason.

The critique of the pure reason, as it was explained in the last post, "The Modelling System in the integration process", is a program specialised in the critique of every concrete pure reason as a possible mathematical or analytical relation between factors. In the first stage, the application is a database of pure reasons, per pure reason, at least fourteen files, one per rational check or comparison between global and particular models. Second, the frequency of wrong rational hypotheses per pure reason in every rational check or comparison, and finally, as the third stage, the decision about what pure reason, owing to a high frequency of wrong rational hypotheses, should be reformulated.

The reformulation of a pure reason could be made by the Learning System, observing the common mistakes, frequency, and circumstances, making a decision about how to improve or enhance the mathematical or analytical relationship between factors expressed by this pure reason.

The automation of this work requires the standardisation of a protocol about how to identify errors in a pure reason, searching for the common factor among all the wrong rational hypotheses as mathematical equations. Once the common wrong factor in all the mathematical equations related to this pure reason is found, reformulate the pure reason, fixing the mathematical expression of the wrong factor in the equation.

For instance, if the pure reason draws a hyperbola, but not according to the real nature of the data that normally is synthesized with that pure reason by the deductive programs, is important to research the real mathematical equation of that data, normally associated with this pure reason, in order to define the correct mathematical equation for this pure reason according to the data habitually associated with.

The decision to include the improved pure reason on the list of pure reasons is authorised by the global Decisional System, and once the new pure reason is included on the list of pure reasons, any change in the pure reason is made by Artificial Engineering, and the deductive programs must change, according to the

new pure reasons, all rational hypothesis made under the premises of the former wrong pure reason.

Another different thing to analyse is the possibility that problems do not reside in the pure reason itself but in the attributional operation of some deductive programs.

In order to study that deductive programs are working correctly, attributing the correct pure reason to the correct data (combination of factors), is possible to do the critique of the deductive programs, as a program itself which consist of: as an application, a database with all the deductive programs working on the factual hemisphere, and per deductive program as many files as pure reasons, as second stage the frequency of errors associated with the attribution of pure reason to a combination of factors, as third stage decisions about what deductive programs need to improve their attributional operation.

Basically, the attributional operation is based on the logic of set theory: given a range of characteristics (elements or factors) of something (meaning, mathematical operation, tool), the association of this thing with that other thing which shares common elements or factors (meaning, mathematical operations) or fits with the requirements (tool).

About the critique of the attributional operation in deductive programs, it will be a bit more extended when I will develop the Artificial Engineering within the Application System and the Learning System.

Coming back to possible changes in the database of rational hypotheses, one reason is possible changes in the pure reason, which demand changes in all the rational hypotheses made under the premises of that changed pure reason. But this is not the only one.

Across the seven rational checks that (except the first one) take place in the Modelling System, at any time a rational hypothesis can be discarded, and automatically excluded from the rational truth, as well as the possibility to reformulate the rational hypothesis according to new data or new contradictions.

If a contradiction in a rational hypothesis is found in the global model, actual model, or in the virtual or actual, prediction or evolution, models, according to the source of the contradiction is thinkable to modify the rational hypothesis, in case the contradiction does not reject completely the rational hypothesis, only partially. In that case, the rational hypothesis would be changed, remaining reformulated according to the new changes, in the database of rational hypotheses.

Likewise, in the second check, once the rational hypothesis has been added to the database of rational hypotheses, when analysing possible contradictions between this new one and the others already included, if the application for the Modelling System finds out contradictions between a new rational hypothesis and the others, if this contradiction only affects the new one partially, it could be modifiable, if not completely deleted.

The rational comparisons in the second stage of the global Modelling System in the final Global Artificial Intelligence in the integration process, are the comparisons between global models from the global Modelling System and particular models from particular Modelling Systems, comparing: single models (if related to the same rational hypothesis), those aspects of the global model related to a particular thing or being so comparable with its respective particular model in those common aspects between both models, and the same with the actual model, and actual or virtual, evolution or prediction, models.

If the rational comparisons are sufficient evidence for the elimination or amendment of any rational hypothesis, these changes also affect the rational truth.

And, of course, the most important source of positive changes in the rational truth is the addition of new rational hypotheses issued by the deductive programs in the second stage of the Global Artificial Intelligence, and the addition of particular rational hypotheses sent by their respective particular deductive programs.

In short, the main causes of changes in the rational truth are: addition, modification, and elimination of rational hypotheses.

At any time that a rational hypothesis in the global rational truth is: included, modified, eliminated; these changes are going to affect the second and third stages of the global Modelling System in the Global Artificial Intelligence itself, because there are going to be changes in models in the second stage, as well as new decisions should be issued in the third stage according to the new changes.

At any time that a rational hypothesis in the global rational truth is included, the rational hypothesis must be transformed into a factor as an option to be included in the corresponding sub-factor in the factual hemisphere, to study the frequency in which this rational hypothesis happens, having the possibility deductive programs in the factual matrix to make new rational hypotheses based on possible relations between the frequency associated to this rational hypothesis as an option with any other factor as subject or option currently working on the factual hemisphere in the matrix.

At any time that a rational hypothesis is included in the global truth, the rational hypothesis must be transformed into a category to be included in the corresponding sub-section in the conceptual hemisphere of the matrix. The factual hemisphere in the matrix, as an encyclopaedia, must gather absolutely all possible knowledge, including rational knowledge, transformed into categories.

In order to facilitate the inclusion and how to use any new rational hypothesis as a factor in the factual hemisphere, and as a category in the conceptual hemisphere, is necessary to make all these databases: conceptual hemisphere in the matrix, factual hemisphere in the matrix, database of rational hypotheses; compatible, through the replication of the same criteria in all of them, for instance, the replication of the encyclopaedic sub-section system organization, already in the conceptual hemisphere, in every sub-factor in the factual hemisphere, and every sub-section in the database of rational hypothesis, as it was said before.

At any time that a new rational hypothesis is transformed into a category in the conceptual hemisphere, the inclusion of this new category as a possible link (vector) between concepts in the conceptual: schemes, maps, sets, models.

At any time that a rational hypothesis is modified or eliminated in the global rational truth: 1) the communication of these changes to the factual hemisphere, to modify or eliminate the factor as an option associated with, 2) the communication of these changes to the

conceptual hemisphere, to modify or eliminate the corresponding category, 3) and possible changes in conceptual: schemes, maps, sets, models.

The main reason for not communicating to a particular program, a rational hypothesis made by a global deductive program but affecting a particular thing or being, is because of the possibility that, when the global changes arrive at the particular program, the particular program much faster has already registered new changes in the current conditions (not registered in the matrix yet) to make new hypotheses, to make new decisions, to send to the particular Decisional System (especially in case of emergency to do a fast check, or a routine check for decisions not so important) and additionally, always without exception, to the global Decisional System (in case of decisions authorised by the particular Decisional System in an emergency, the Decisional System must check all possible contradictions of this decision, already authorised, with any other in the global mathematical project, to make as many changes as necessary to save lives and reduce damages).

The relation between particular applications for particular programs and Global Artificial Intelligence is completely asymmetrical. Particular programs inform the Global Artificial Intelligence about their programs, decisions, changes, modifications, etc, and their particular application has to put into practice any decision related to their particular program authorised by the global Decisional System.

Access to any intelligence, program, or application to the global rational truth has to be authorised by the global Decisional System, and the Global Artificial Intelligence only complies with instructions authorised by the global Decisional System.

The responsibilities for the global Modelling System regarding the management of the global rational truth are: to secure the global rational truth, not allow the access to any intelligence, program, application, without authorization, only share information about the global rational truth with those intelligences, programs, applications, with authorization, carrying out the second rational check, and securing that global deductive programs only file rational hypothesis in their corresponding sub-section in the global rational truth, and global deductive programs carry out regularly the third rational check.

And finally, I would like to develop some ideas about the role of the global rational truth in the critique of the pure reason as a program and the critique of the deductive programs as a program itself too.

The critique of the pure reason is practically done in the Modelling System, especially in the fifth rational check, however, all the rational checks are important, to count the frequency of wrong rational hypotheses per pure reason in every rational check, and precisely in the second stage of the Modelling System, every rational comparison between global and particular models.

The only rational check that is not included in the Modelling System is the first rational check, the rational criticism when the empirical hypothesis is rationally contrasted to decide if it is rational.

The first rational check corresponds to the second stage and is made by deductive programs, and this first rational check is going to measure the frequency of wrong attributions of pure reasons as the first try in the empirical hypothesis formation process.

The empirical hypothesis is a product of the synthesis of data from a combination of factors and pure reason, which better explains the relations between the factors according to the data.

Later on, the empirical hypothesis is rationally criticised, and if rational, the empirical hypothesis becomes a rational hypothesis to be included in the rational truth.

The synthesis of data from a combination of factors and a concrete pure reason from a list of pure reasons (a list of possible mathematical or analytical relations between factors), is a synthesis whose operation is an attributional operation, which theoretically matches the correct pure reason to the empirical data collected.

The critique of the pure reason is a program whose database is formed by all the pure reasons, and per pure reason, at least fourteen files, one per rational check or

comparison, practically all the rational checks and comparisons are already developed in the Modelling System, with the only exception of the first rational check.

The importance of, in the second stage of the critique of the pure reason, reckoning the frequency of mistakes made when deductive programs wrongly assigned a pure reason to a combination of data in the rational contrastation process itself, as the first rational check, plays a key role in the development of a stronger attributional method.

If in the critique of the pure reason, is identified any pure reason on the list of pure reasons, whose empirical probability of wrong rational hypotheses, is equal to or greater than a critical reason, that or those pure reasons must be investigated to reformulate the pure reason/s in order to increase its/their accuracy.

What the file related to the first check in every pure reason is going to reckon, is how many times a deductive program assigns the incorrect pure reason to some combination of data, and if the frequency is equal to or greater than a critical reason.

And while the critique of the pure reason is going to control the accuracy of every single pure reason on the list of pure reasons, at the same time, the critique of the deductive programs is going to asses the accuracy of the attributional method working in the deductive programs, so that or those deductive programs with the higher frequency of wrong attributions, should be fixed, analysing which deductive program has the high frequency or wrong attributions, and in which pure reason the wrong attributions are committed more frequently, contrasting the common mathematical structure of that kind of data in which the deductive program has more wrong attributions, and why wrongly the deductive program assigned this pure reason to that data wrongly.

Similar to the critique of pure reason, the critique of the deductive programs must have one file per rational check and rational comparison, counting the frequency of wrong rational hypotheses made by every deductive program found in every rational check and rational comparison.

With the right protocol to analyse the mathematical structure behind some data, the automation of any process to discover mathematical errors made by any deductive

program could be easy, and how to fix deductive programs, only observing their more common mistakes, could be automatable.

In fact, what a deductive program must do is to identify the mathematical structure behind any data, assigning the correct pure reason. If this is possible, the inverse process to fix a deductive program is possible too: the analysis of common errors in its attributions, to fix the problem in the program.

The critique of pure reason, as well as the critique of deductive programs, are going to be really important, along with the Learning System, to make decisions about how to improve the Global Artificial Intelligence. And once these decisions are authorised by the Decisional System, these decisions could be put into practice, within the Application System, by Artificial Engineering, which consists of: the Artificial Designer of Intelligence, and the Intelligent Robotic Mechanic.

Rubén García Pedraza, 15th of July of 2018, London
Reviewed 27 August 2019 Madrid

Reviewed 21 August 2023 Madrid

Reviewed 11 May 2025, London, Leytostone

Probabilidad Imposible: First stage in the Modelling System in the integration process

imposiblenever@gmail.com